#6

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

Application No.

09/669,771

Examiner

Christopher Bottorff

Applicant(s)

Mizukami et al.

Group Art Unit

3611

(1) Christopher Bottorff, Patent Examiner (3)
(2) Mark Neblett, Attorney For Applicants (4)
Date of Interview Jan 15, 2002
Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference c) ☑ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☑ pplicant's representative]
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d)
Claim(s) discussed: Claim
Identification of prior art discussed: Taurus, Subaru, and Toshihiro eld.
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The general termhology of the claims was discused, such as "generally centralized region" and "concentration". The use of more specific terminology for describing component locations was also discussed.
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, is available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)
i) 🔣 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).
Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST

Chustyr Bitterf

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.